

GROWTH STRATEGIES POLICY OPTIONS MATRIX - DRAFT

October 18, 2007

#	2004 RTP	POLICY	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	COSTS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	Yes	Identify regionally strategic areas for infill and investment*	Identify strategic opportunity areas for infill development of aging and underutilized areas and increased investment in order to accommodate future growth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - efficient use of existing and planned infrastructure - revitalizes aging communities - increases local tax base - reduces sprawling development patterns 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
2	Yes	Structure the plan on a 3-tiered system of centers development*	Identify strategic centers based on a 3-tiered system of existing, planned, and potential, relative to transportation infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - prioritizes investment based on infrastructure timing - supports long range conceptual planning in advance of financial commitments 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
3	No	Develop nodes on a corridor*	Intensify nodes along corridors with people-scaled, mixed use developments. Many existing corridors lack the residential and commercial concentration to adequately support non-auto transit uses, without which the existing transit system cannot fully realize its potential for accommodating additional trips and relieving the transportation system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - creates vibrant, walkable communities with localized access to amenities - supports region's existing & planned transit infrastructure 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
4	Yes	Develop "complete communities"*	Create mixed use districts or "complete communities" in strategic growth areas, through a concentration of activities with housing, employment, and a mix of retail and services, located in close proximity to each other.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay -ensures many daily needs can be met within a short distance of home - increases walk and bicycle trip opportunities - supports lower VMT through "trip chaining" 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
5	Yes	Plan for additional housing and jobs near transit*	Plan for additional housing and jobs within reach of the transit network. Pedestrian-friendly environments and more compact development patterns in close proximity to transit serve to support and improve transit use and ridership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces VMT, VHT and congestion delay - reduces auto use and supports more multi modal travel behavior - reduces need for long commutes -increases viability of rail network for home to work trips 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
6	Yes	Plan for a changing demand in types of housing*	Plan for changing demographics and subsequent impacts on the region's economic future. Shifts in the labor force, as the large cohort of aging "baby boomers" retire over the next 15 years and are replaced by new immigrants and "echo boomers", will likely induce a demand shift in the housing market for additional development types such as multi-family and infill housing in central locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - supports needs and lifestyles of growing segments of the population - increases affordable housing alternatives - supports changing market dynamics - limits greenfields development 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.

* Approved by CEHD as a 2008 RTP Growth Policy on August 30, 2007

GROWTH STRATEGIES POLICY OPTIONS MATRIX - DRAFT

October 18, 2007

#	2004 RTP	POLICY	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	COSTS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
7	Yes	Continue to protect stable existing single family areas*	Continue to protect stable existing single family neighborhoods as future growth and a more diverse housing stock are accommodated in infill locations near transit stations, in nodes along corridors and in existing centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - maintains existing urban fabric in the majority of the region - reduces NIMBYism of intensification of appropriate areas 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
8	Yes	Ensure adequate access to open space and preservation of habitat	Ensure access to open space and habitat preservation despite competing quality of life demands driven by growth, housing and employment needs, and traditional development patterns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduces regional VMT, VHT and congestion delay - improves access to existing large-scale and neighborhood-scale open space - preserves the rapidly diminishing open space - limits leap frog development 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p> <p>SCAG should work to identify funding resources to assist local governments' voluntary implementation</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits and identify resources to assist local governments implement as appropriate.
9	Yes	Incorporate local input and feedback on future growth assumptions	Continue public outreach efforts as required by SAFTEA-LU and incorporate local input through the Integrated Growth Forecast. This innovative approach provides a more accurate forecast that integrates future land use and transportation planning through growth projections for population, employment, households and housing units. Public workshops, scenario planning, and stakeholder outreach improve the accuracy and feasibility of pursuing regional plans at the local level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increases consistency between local and regional forecasts - identifies areas where discrepancies may exist - improves discourse between government agencies, stakeholders and the public 	<p>No direct costs in RTP</p>	<p>1) Include in the 2008 Draft Policy Growth Forecast Alternative</p> <p>2) Use the 2008 RTP Draft Baseline Growth Forecast Alternative without this policy option</p>	Support Option 1 to realize the stated benefits.

* Approved by CEHD as a 2008 RTP Growth Policy on August 30, 2007

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
A	Transit Reliability and Performance	No	Use technology to monitor, report and improve on-time performance through operational improvements, rapid bus technologies, and better scheduling of services.	Limited costs incorporated through O & M funds committed. Total Potential Cost Undetermined.	Some commitments in the existing O & M commitments, but not all resources identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improves customer satisfaction - Improves reliability of trips (number one issue of concern to transit riders) - Increases efficiency - Improves system productivity - Reduces dependence on highway system - Supports TOD investments 	- Uncertain funding for O & M	Should our existing and future transit investments be operated in a manner so as to maximize customer satisfaction and usage? Should new technology be used for effective monitoring and measurement of performance?	<p>Staff recommends developing a policy to encourage the use of new technologies to monitor, enhance, and report transit system reliability and performance.</p> <p>Seek funding in next OWP (FY08-09).</p>
B	Transit Service Levels	No	Increase transit service levels to accommodate regional growth in demand, and to foster increased use.	Total Potential Cost Undetermined	Some commitments in the existing O & M commitments, but not all resources identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can encourage increased use of transit - Greater use of transit for business, social, cultural, and tourism travel - Improves access by transit through reduced travel and wait times 	- Uncertain funding for O & M	Should our existing and future transit investments be operated in a manner so as to maximize customer satisfaction and usage?	<p>Staff recommends that regional and local operator transit service policies be assessed to determine how to optimize service levels to achieve maximum potential use of our transit investments.</p> <p>Seek funding in next OWP (FY08-09).</p>
C	Fare policies, Fare media, Subsidies to Transit	No	Adjust transit fares to maximize transit usage, including fare free concepts. Utilize new automated fare media to allow for ease of transit use. Increase subsidy levels to maximize transit ridership.	Total Potential Cost Undetermined	Some commitments in the existing O & M commitments, but not all resources identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater use of transit - Can reduce long term costs for highway operations and infrastructure, reducing total costs to the region 	- Uncertain funding for O & M	Should our existing and future transit investments be operated in a manner so as to maximize customer satisfaction and usage?	<p>Staff recommends that a fare policy be analyzed to assess the proper level of fares and subsidies to maximize transit use in the Region.</p> <p>Seek funding in next OWP (FY08-09).</p>
D	Increase Transit Connectivity	No	Restructure transit services, as needed, to more effectively connect different urban centers and activities. Enhance connectivity and ease of transfer between transit modes.	Total Potential Cost Undetermined	Some commitments in the existing O & M commitments, but not all resources identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases connections to urban centers and TOD (supports the Regional Growth Strategy) - Increases connections to activity centers, including retail, cultural, social, and recreational activities - Improved intermodal connections allows for greater use of different modes for different trip needs 	- Uncertain funding for O & M	Should the transit system serve and support our urban environment and support the 2% Strategy? Should the transit system function as a set of "standalone" components or as a "system" to maximize the benefits of the different components?	<p>Staff recommends that regional and local operator transit service policies be assessed to determine how to optimize connectivity to regional centers, and facilitate intermodal transit service to achieve maximum potential use of our transit investments.</p> <p>Seek funding in next OWP (FY08-09).</p>

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	Expo Phase II	Yes	Extension of Expo light rail from Culver City to Santa Monica	\$855 million	\$256 million programmed	- High performing corridor in past RTP's (highest transit demand) - Strong local commitments to TOD - Limited opportunities for expansion of highway/freeway capacity	- Uncertainty over route - Uncertainty over costs	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1.
2	Crenshaw Corridor	Yes	Transit Corridor-Technology/Mode Undetermined	\$788 million	\$18 million programmed	- In past RTP's, serves high transit use area - Potential for a branch to Expo - Limited opportunities for expansion of highway/freeway capacity - Potential access to LAX area	- Uncertain funding commitments - Uncertainty over route - Uncertainty over costs - Uncertainty over mode choice - Limited ROW	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1.
3	Regional Connector	Yes	LRT Connection between Gold Line and Expo/Long Beach Lines through LA CBD	\$1 billion	\$0 committed at this time	Connection of all Light Rail into a continuous system would allow all systems to interconnect for continuous trips: - Reducing transfers - Increases ridership	- Uncertain funding commitments - Limited ROW - Potential for costly subway construction	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1.
4	Orange Line BRT Extension	Yes	Orange Line BRT Extension from Canoga to Chatsworth	\$214 million	\$118 million programmed for Phase 1 through 4	- Low cost BRT extension - Increased use of current Orange Line investment - Connecting services to Metrolink services at Chatsworth	- Serves an area with low current transit ridership.	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1.
5	Green Line LRT Extension	Yes	LRT connection into LAX complex by extending the existing Green Line	\$202 million	\$0 committed at this time- Possible Airport related financing options	- Improves system connectivity - Improves ground access to LAX - Improved effectiveness of existing Green Line performance	- Uncertain funding commitments - Undetermined access to LAX - Available track capacity Issues with freight railroads	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 2.
6	Gold Line Extension	Yes	Phase 1: Phased Extension SMV to Azusa II Phase 2: Azusa II to Montclair Phase 3: Montclair to Ontario Airport-newly proposed and still in feasibility study	Phase 1: \$423 million Phase 2: \$859 million Phase 3: TBD	SCAG includes Phase I to Azusa II as a Baseline Project due to project readiness criteria; LACMTA is unsure on funding O & M, Phase I to Azusa II is not in the MTA proposed list of Baseline projects--SANBAG has committed funding for Phase II Azusa II to Montclair. \$36 million - Phase 1 programming	- Cities in corridor have strong commitments to TOD - Environmental completed pending ROD for Phase One to Azusa II - Relatively low cost per mile on existing ROW	- Inadequate funding commitment (LACMTA has thus far not committed to operation of Phase I to Azusa II; LACMTA funding has not been identified for the extension to Montclair)	1) Include Phase 1 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phases 2 & 3 in the Strategic Plan. 2) Include Phases 1 & 2 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phase 3 in the Strategic Plan. 3) Include Phases 1, 2, & 3 in the Constrained Plan.	Support Option 2. Seek additional State and Federal funds.
7	Purple Line Extension	Yes (to Fair-fax)	Phase 1: Phased Extension Western to La Cienega Phase 2: La Cienega to Century City Phase 3: Century City to UCLA and beyond	Phase 1: \$1.3 billion Phase 2: TBD Phase 3: TBD	No commitments from LACMTA, at this time.	- High performing corridor in past RTP's (highest transit demand) - Strong local commitments to TOD - Limited opportunities for expansion of highway/freeway capacity	- Very limited surface ROW (subway) - High construction costs (subway)	1) Include Phase 1 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phases 2 & 3 in the Strategic Plan. 2) Include Phases 1 & 2 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phase 3 in the Strategic Plan. 3) Include Phases 1, 2, & 3 in the Constrained Plan.	Support Option 1. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
8	Metrolink Strategic Plan	No	Strategic investments in additional track capacity, signaling, station capacity, cars, locomotives, support facilities, and new service levels to maximize ridership potential	\$4 billion	No commitments from CTC at this time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Maximizes and leverages the current investment in the regional commuter rail system- Supports TOD commitments near stations- Reduces future highway operating and infrastructure demands	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Limited available funding for transit capital and operations	Should we maximize our future investment in regional transit capacity? Would this help tie the regional transit investments together with a connecting system? Will this reduce long term demand on our freeway system?	Staff recommends that the Metrolink Strategic Plan be put into the RTP Strategic Plan.
9	Temecula Extension Metrolink	No	Extend Metrolink from South Perris to Temecula	\$250 million	RCTC commitment to this project by 2025	Extension of Perris Line: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Good Commuter Rail Performance- Local commitments to 2% strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Serves an area with low current transit ridership.	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1. Seek additional State and Federal funds.
10	San Jacinto Extension Metrolink	No	Extend Metrolink from South Perris to San Jacinto	\$120 million	RCTC commitment to this project by 2025	Extension of Perris Line: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Uses existing ROW- Good Commuter Rail Performance- Local commitments to 2% strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Serves an area with low current transit ridership.	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 1. Seek additional State and Federal funds.
11	LOSSAN Strategic Plan	No	Systemic Capacity and Service improvements on the LOSSAN Rail Intercity Rail Corridor	\$3.2-\$4 billion	Limited commitments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Expands Intercity and Commuter Capacity in the LOSSAN- Relieves congestion in the I-5 and 101 Corridors, improves utilization of existing investments- Potential for future inter-regional funding or Amtrak reauthorization	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Uncertain funding commitments	1) Include entire LOSSAN Plan in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include committed portions in the Constrained Plan Include uncommitted portions in the Strategic Plan. 3) Include entire LOSSAN Plan in the Strategic Plan.	Support Option 2. Seek additional State and Federal funds.
12	Orangeline (Orangeline Development Authority)	Yes	108-mile grade-separated, elevated Maglev down the Pacific Electric ROW through central Orange County to L.A. Union Station out to Santa Clarita and Palmdale. The Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA) is a JPA made up of cities from L.A. and Orange Counties. The financial plan calls for private funding for most capital costs.	\$19 billion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-\$250,000 planning grant from the federal government-\$1 million in-kind commitment from private sector group led by Arcadis-Dues from 14 member cities of the JPA-No other financial commitment from the private sector at this time	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Environmentally friendly-Helps regional economy-Increases transit ridership-Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario, Palmdale, San Bernardino and March airports-Improves public health-Will provide construction jobs-Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Inadequate funding commitment-Untested technologies-Operation & Maintenance data is sparse-Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA-Capital costs need more vetting-Corridor not well-suited for high-speed Maglev technology. There are 14 stops in a 33-mile segment in the P.E. ROW which greatly reduces the capability of high-speed Maglev-LACMTA and OCTA own the P.E. ROW and have not shown any indication of giving the ROW to the Orangeline Development Authority-Minimal support from Orange County cities and no commitment from OCTA	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 2. Conduct Alternatives Analysis as to appropriate mode and technology options.

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	Initial Operating Segment (IOS)	yes	Fully grade-separated, elevated High-Speed Regional Transport (HSRT) system that operates primarily within freeway corridors. The adopted IOS is from West L.A./LAX to L.A. Union Station to West Covina to Ontario Airport.	\$9-\$11 billion for passenger service only (Assumes small amount of public ROW and small amount of land purchases in constrained areas. Land purchases for stations not included).	\$0 commitment at this time	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Untested technologies -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -West L.A. station site not selected. Land availability is questionable. -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Community issues with HSRT coming to LAX	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 1. Include in the Constrained Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Form JPA for the IOS -Form public-private partnership -Secure funding -Technology selection
2	Extended Initial Operating Segment (IOS plus San Bernardino)	yes	The adopted IOS plus an extension to San Bernardino.	\$2 billion for the extension (11-\$13 billion for the full IOS plus extension, passenger service only)	\$0 commitment at this time	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA) -San Bernardino supportive of HSRT	-Inadequate funding commitment -Untested technologies -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -West L.A. station site not selected. Land availability is questionable. -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Community issues with HSRT coming to LAX	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 1. Include in the Constrained Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Form JPA for the IOS -Form public-private partnership -Secure funding -Conduct Preliminary Engineering (P.E.) for IOS extension to San Bernardino -Technology selection
3	Anaheim- Ontario	Represent- ed on the Maglev map in the 2004 RTP for further study but not in the 2004 RTP Constrained Plan	The Anaheim to Ontario segment is 32-miles and takes approximately 18 minutes. This link would connect commuters from Riverside County to job centers in Orange County and shift air passengers from JWA to Ontario Airport.	\$2.77 billion (2005 dollars) (Assumes public ROW and no land purchases).	\$0 commitment at this time for the Anaheim to Ontario portion. \$45 million allotted for the Nevada segment (Las Vegas to Primm) under T3 federal legislation. Attempt by CNSSTC, OCTA and Anaheim to reconcile the federal funding to allow some of the \$45 million to be spent on planning and environmental work in the Anaheim to Ontario segment. OCTA is also in negotiations with CHSRA to fund a feasibility study in the Anaheim to Ontario corridor if funding is available.	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at JWA and LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario Airport -Clears out the heavily congested SR-91 or SR-57 corridor during peak commute times -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA) -Will serve the planned Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Relying on federal funding to cover capital costs is unlikely -Untested technologies -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Capital costs need to be revisited and refined -Route to Inland Empire not yet selected -Significant environmental issues (i.e., the Prado Dam, species habitat) in the corridor	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of the Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 1. Include in the Constrained Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Secure funding -Form public-private partnerships -Feasibility and planning studies needed -Form partnerships with OCTA and/or CNSSTC -Select route to Inland Empire (SR-91 or SR-57) -Conduct a feasibility study that examines possible intermediate stops
4	Mid-term (pre 2035) HSRT system	yes (except the spur to the San Pedro ports)	The mid-term HSRT system includes the adopted IOS (2004 RTP) plus the San Bernardino extension, the Anaheim to Ontario link, plus a freight spur connecting the San Pedro Ports to the IOS.	\$25-\$27 billion (Assumes small amount of public ROW and small amount of land purchases in constrained areas. Does not include: Land purchases for stations, port automation costs, purchase of land and construction costs at the San Pedro Ports and selected Inland Port facilities)	\$0 commitment at this time	-Relieves port congestion -Provides a transit option in the I-405 corridor -Develops Palmdale Airport -Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario, Palmdale and JWA -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Location of inland port facilities need to be identified -Port infrastructure requirements/costs need to keep up with HSRT system -Untested technologies -Little interest from shippers and ports -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -little support from Orange County for LAX-South route	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 1. Include in the Constrained Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Expand JPA to include entire HSRT system -Systemwide investment-grade business case -Secure funding -Form public-private partnerships -More in-depth engineering and design work -Form partnerships with stakeholders

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
5	Long-term HSRT long-term (post 2035) system	yes	In addition to the mid-term HSRT system, the following routes will be further studied: LAX-South (Orange County down Interstate 405), LAX-Palmdale, Irvine to San Bernardino, San Bernardino to Victorville, Victorville to Palmdale, and March Airport to San Diego.	TBD	\$0 commitment at this time	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario, Palmdale, San Bernardino and March airports -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Untested technologies -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Capital costs unclear -Little or no study has been done on these corridors	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).	Support Option 2. Consider as a long-term priority of the RTP Strategic Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Secure funding -Form public-private partnerships -Feasibility and planning studies needed -Form partnerships with stakeholders
6	Orangeline (Orangeline Development Authority)	yes	108-mile grade-separated, elevated Maglev down the Pacific Electric ROW through central Orange County to L.A. Union Station out to Santa Clarita and Palmdale. The Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA) is a JPA made up of cities from L.A. and Orange Counties. The financial plan calls for private funding for most capital costs.	\$19 billion	-\$250,000 planning grant from the federal government -\$1 million in-kind commitment from private sector group led by Arcadis -Dues from 14 member cities of the JPA -No other financial commitment from the private sector at this time	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario, Palmdale, San Bernardino and March airports -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Untested technologies -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Capital costs need more vetting -Corridor not well-suited for high-speed Maglev technology. There are 14 stops in a 33-mile segment in the P.E. ROW which greatly reduces the capability of high-speed Maglev -LACMTA and OCTA own the P.E. ROW and have not shown any indication of giving the ROW to the Orangeline Development Authority -Minimal support from Orange County cities and no commitment from OCTA	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP). 3) Remove from HSRT matrix and include in Transit matrix.	Support Option 3. Remove from HSRT matrix and include in Transit matrix.
7	California-Nevada Maglev (California-Nevada SuperSpeed Train Commission)	Represented on the Maglev map in the 2004 RTP for further study but not in the 2004 RTP Constrained Plan	A 269-mile grade-separated Maglev system from Anaheim to Las Vegas, Nevada. The German consortium Transrapid International hopes to build a demonstration line from Las Vegas to Primm, Nevada. The finance plan is to garner federal funding for capital construction.	\$24 billion (Anaheim to Las Vegas)	\$45 million allotted for the Nevada segment under T3 legislation. Attempt by CNSSTC, OCTA and Anaheim to reconcile the federal funding to allow some of the \$45 million to be spent on planning and environmental work in the Anaheim to Ontario segment.	-Environmentally friendly -Helps regional economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at JWA and LAX and shifts air passengers to Ontario Airport -Clears out the heavily congested SR-91 or SR-57 corridor during peak commute times -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, CHSRA)	-Inadequate funding commitment -Relying on federal funding to cover capital costs is unlikely -Untested technologies -Operation & Maintenance data is sparse -Technology may not be compatible with CHSRA -Capital costs are old and need to be updated -Route to Inland Empire not yet selected -Significant environmental issues (i.e., the Prado Dam, species habitat) in the corridor	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP). 3) Drop from the RTP	Support Option 2. Consider as a long-term priority of the RTP Strategic Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Secure funding -Form public-private partnerships -Feasibility and planning studies needed -Form partnerships with OCTA and CNSSTC -Select route to Inland Empire (SR-91 or SR-57)
8	California High-Speed Rail (California High-Speed Rail Authority)	No	700-mile steel wheel high-speed rail network that will serve the Bay Area, Sacramento, the San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles, Orange County, the Inland Empire and San Diego. The system would compete directly with air travel for the long-haul intrastate trips.	\$33-\$39 billion for the entire state system (\$31.5 billion for the CHSRA IOS from Anaheim to the Bay Area)	\$20.7 million allocated from the California state legislature to continue funding the state agency. \$3.5 million in funding from OCTA to begin the EIR for the L.A. to O.C. segment. Funding from this project is proposed to be from state bonds. A \$9.95 billion bond is slated for the November 2008 ballot.	-Steel wheels is proven technology with standardized O&M costs -Environmentally friendly (although maybe less so than Maglev) -Helps state economy -Increases transit ridership -Relieves overcrowding at major airports -Provides an option to flying for intrastate connections -Connects city centers in Northern and Southern California -Improves public health -Will provide construction jobs -Provides intermodal connections with other systems (e.g., Metrolink, SCAG's HSRT, Caltrain) -San Diego (SANDAG) includes CHSRA project in their RTP's fiscally constrained plan	-Inadequate funding commitment -Passage of bond(s) can be difficult -Using "old" technology -Technology not compatible with Maglev systems not be compatible with CHSRA -Political support at the state level not certain -Potential political opposition from the airlines	1) Include in the Constrained Plan. 2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP). 3) Drop from the RTP	Support Option 2. Consider as a long-term priority of the RTP Strategic Plan. Requisite Milestones: -Secure funding -Complete EISs for various segments -Select Bay Area route -SCAG should form a partnership with CHSRA and OCTA -Work to ensure construction begins in Northern California and Southern California simultaneously -Conduct further research on funding

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with Extended IOS and Anaheim to Ontario HSRT segment	No	Complete Extended IOS portion of adopted HSRT system with Anaheim to Ontario segment and implement market incentives for aviation decentralization	\$17-\$19 billion to implement Extended IOS portion of adopted HSRT system (passengers only). Local airport ground access projects \$2.3-5.3 billion	\$0 commitment at this time for HSRT. \$45 million allotted for the Nevada segment under T3 legislation. Efforts by CNSSTS, OCTA and Anaheim to reconcile the federal funding to allow some of the \$45 million to be spent on planning and environmental work.	Problems and uncertainties associated with implementing full HSRT avoided (the extended IOS has a better "business case" but still has funding uncertainties). New terminal development and ground access improvements needed at San Bernardino and Palmdale airports, but less extensive at Palmdale Airport than with full HSRT system.	At 162 MAP a loss of 8 MAP compared to 2035 regional aviation scenario with entire adopted HSRT system. Fewer economic and jobs/housing balance benefits particularly in North LA County.	High capital costs and funding uncertainties, and difficult political consensus, associated with implementing the Extended IOS (but less than the entire adopted HSRT system). Options are: (1) No recommendation (2) include in Constrained Plan (3) Include in Strategic Plan	Include in the Constrained Plan Requisite Milestones: --Same as for the HSRT IOS, but with emphasis on developing terminal-to-terminal airport linkages in in-depth engineering and design work for HSRT --Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports. --Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies
2	Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with entire HSRT system, with Anaheim to Ontario segment	No	Complete entire adopted HSRT system with Anaheim to Ontario segment, that is necessary to reach 170 MAP and implement market incentives for aviation decentralization	Cost to be determined to implement entire adopted HSRT system with long-range connections to Victorville and San Bernardino (passengers only) local airport ground access projects \$2.3-5.3 billion	\$0 commitment at this time for HSRT. \$45 million allotted for the Nevada segment under T3 legislation. Efforts by CNSSTS, OCTA and Anaheim to reconcile the federal funding to allow some of the \$45 million to be spent on planning and environmental work.	Achieves 170 million MAP with associated economic and jobs/housing balance benefits to the Inland Empire and North LA County.	Extensive new passenger terminals and ground access improvements needed at Palmdale and San Bernardino International airports. Air quality impacts likely greater than other scenarios because of higher number of aircraft operations (but partly offset by fewer ground access emissions from HSRT).	High capital costs and funding uncertainties, and difficult political consensus, associated with implementing the entire adopted HSRT system. Options are: (1) No recommendation (2) Include in Constrained Plan (3) Include in Strategic Plan	Include in the Strategic Plan, mid- and long-term Requisite Milestones: --Same as for the entire HSRT long-term system, but with emphasis on developing terminal-to-terminal airport linkages in in-depth engineering and design work and feasibility and planning studies for HSRT --Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports. --Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies
3	Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with no HSRT	Yes	No HSRT implementation but implement market incentives for aviation decentralization	NO HSRT costs. Other ground access costs in unconstrained Airport Ground Access Element total \$5.2 billion (\$2.3 billion constrained)	\$2.3 billion for non-HSRT airport ground access projects	Problems and uncertainties associated with implementing HSRT avoided. New terminal development and ground access improvements needed at Palmdale and San Bernardino International airports much less extensive	At 152.6 million air passengers (MAP) in 2035, this scenario represents a loss of 17.4 MAP compared to 2035 regional aviation scenario with entire adopted HSRT system. Fewer economic and jobs/housing balance benefits to the Inland Empire and North LA County. Represents a loss of about \$11 billion and 78,600 jobs compared to the 2035 scenario with the entire adopted HSRT system.	Implementation difficulties of relying upon HSRT avoided. Ground access improvements and market incentives still need to be implemented in this scenario. Options are: (1) No recommendation (2) include in Constrained Plan (3) include in Strategic Plan	No recommendation to include in the 2008 RTP at this time. Requisite Milestones: --Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports. --Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies